

REMARKS

The Examiner's comments from the Office Action mailed April 2, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 6, 7, 18, and 24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims 6, 7, 18, and 24 in a continuing application. Claims 1-8 and 13-17, and 19-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 13, 16, 19, 21, and 23 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and figures. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

Formal objection has been made to the drawings for omitting subject matter from claim 17. Applicants respectfully point out the subject matter of claim 17 is shown in the drawings, e.g., in FIG. 1. For example, in FIG. 1, tube 26 is attached to tube 22 along the entire length of tube 26. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Formal objection has been made to claim 1 for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants assert appropriate correction has been made. The recitation of claim 1 has been reorganized to provide proper antecedent basis.

Formal objection has been made to claim 13 for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants have reviewed claim 13 and cannot find the relevant text. After further review, Applicants believe the Examiner intended to object to claim 21 instead of claim 13. Appropriate correction has been made to claim 21. If Applicants have misinterpreted the objection, then Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Formal objection also has been made to claim 23 for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants assert appropriate correction has been made to claim 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the above objections and allowance of the pending claims.

Claim Rejections

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Office Action notes claim language appears to be missing from claim 21. Applicants assert appropriate correction has been made to claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 21.

Claims 1-4, 13-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Wilson (EP 0 897 700). Claim 18 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of claim 18 in a later filed continuing application. With respect to claims 1-4, 13-17, 19, and 21-23, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a main exit port and a branch exit port are located at first and second distances, respectively, from the distal end of a catheter. The first and second distances are substantially equal. The branch guidewire enclosure is coupled to the channel adjacent the branch exit port.

Wilson does not disclose or suggest a main exit port and a branch exit port extending substantially equal distances proximally from the distal end of a catheter. Rather, Wilson discloses a side port 53C provided on a catheter 50 and a positioning guidewire lumen 55A having an open end spaced outside the patient's body. See *Wilson*, paragraph 118 ("The distal end 56B of the integrated stent-positioning guide wire 56A then is advanced by the physician by pushing the proximal end 56C from outside the body"). The open end of positioning guidewire lumen 55A (shown adjacent 56C of FIGS. 12B and 12C) is not located at a substantially equal distance from the distal end of the catheter as the side port 53C.

Furthermore, Wilson does not disclose or suggest a branch guidewire enclosure coupled to a channel adjacent a branch exit port. While the positioning guidewire lumen 55A is coupled to the catheter 50 adjacent the side port 53C, the open end (shown adjacent 56C) of the positioning guidewire lumen 55A is spaced apart and separate from the catheter 50.

For at least these reasons, Wilson does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-5 and 8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and

allowance of claims 1-5 and 8 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 13 recites, in part, a three-way bond that couples a proximal tube portion to a proximal open end of a first tube and a proximal open end of a second tube.

Wilson does not disclose or suggest a three-way bond that couples a proximal tube portion to a proximal open end of a first tube and a proximal open end of a second tube. Rather, a mid-portion of positioning guidewire lumen 55A is coupled to a catheter 50. The open end of the positioning guidewire lumen 55A is not coupled to the catheter 50. In fact, the open end (see near 56C) of the positioning guidewire lumen 55A appears to be located outside the patient's body. See *Wilson*, paragraph 118.

For at least these reasons, Wilson does not anticipate claim 13. Claims 14-23 depend from claim 13 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 13-23 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

35 USC § 103

Claims 5, 6, 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson. Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to this claim. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of claim 6 in a later filed continuing application. With respect to claims 5, 8, and 20, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 5 and 8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Wilson for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 5 and 8 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 20 depends from claim 13 and is allowable over Wilson for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 13. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 20 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 7

The second page of the Office Action indicates claim 7 stands rejected. However, no substantive rejection appears to have been made to claim 7. To the extend the above rejections apply to claim 7, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over the Wilson reference for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: July 2, 2007

/Joshua N. Randall/
Joshua N. Randall
Reg. No. 50,719
JNR/JKS:rlk

